



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

available : *wæs mæn fæder folcum gecyþed, . . . hine gearwe geman / witenas welhwyle wide geond eorþan*, 262.

31. *dat dū neo dana halt mit sus sippan man dinc ni gileitōs.*

A legal term is here applied to a situation which is liable to lead to battle (cf. Ehrismann, *Beitr.*, xxxii, 281; also my note, *J. Engl. and Gmc. Ph.*, viii, 255 f.). It should be compared to *þing gehēgan*—which refers, indeed, to the consummation of the proceeding—in Beow. 424 : *ond nū wið Grendel sceal . . . ana gehēgan / ðing wið þyrse*. This parallel, briefly mentioned by F. Schulz,³ seems to have been practically ignored, though Trautmann naturally ascribed this very phrase to his OE. *Ur-Hildebrand*.

41. *pist alsō gialtēt man, sō dū ēwīn inwit fuortōs* 'du bist in Lug und Trug (Tücke) alt geworden.' It is worthy of note that in Brun. 46 one of the enemies, Constantinus, receives the epithet of *eald inwitta*. This interesting coupling of 'cunning' and 'old' (so also Hildebr. 39: *dū bist dir altēr Hūn, unmet spāhēr*) may be considered a not unnatural variant of the traditional association of 'old age' and 'wisdom.' An intermediate position is occupied by *Ludewic der alte*, who shows *starke liste*, Kudr. 894, cf. 897.⁴

- 44a. *tōt ist Hiltibrant.*

Without entering upon the question of the meter, I beg to cite the similar half-line, Beow. 1323b : *dēad is Aeschere*,—the metrical status of which has, by the way, likewise been discussed (Child, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxi, 199).

51. *dār man mih eo scerita in folc sceotantero.*

A similar thought is expressed, though in different phrasing and syntax, in Beow. 2638 ff. : *ðē hē ūs ic on herge gecēas / tō ðyssum sīðfate . . . þe hē ūs ic gārwiġend gōde tealde.*

65. *dō stōpun tō samane.*

In addition to the parallels cited in *M. S. D.*,

³ F. Schulz, *Die Sprachformen des Hildebrands-Liedes im Beowulf*. Königsberg Programm, 1882.

⁴ Perhaps much stress cannot be laid on Predigtbruchst. (Gr.-Wü., II, 110), l. 32 : *wacað se ealda* (the devil), . . . *ēhteð æfestrā, inwit sāweð.*

p. 11, and by Heinzel, *Über die ostgotische Heldensage*, p. 49, there may be mentioned Mald. 8 : *tō þære hilde stōp* (on foot), and *Lazamon's Brut*, 28408 f. : *heo togadere stopen / and sturnliche fuhten*, where *togadere*, however, possibly refers to the assembling of Arthur's host rather than to the encounter of the two armies. The use of *tō samane* is matched by that of *tōgædere* in Beow. 2630 *syððan hē tōgædre gegān hæfdon*, Mald. 67 *tō lang hit him þūhte, / hwaenne hī tōgædere gāras bēron*.

68. *giwigan miti wābnum.*

A corresponding phrase carrying the sense to be postulated for this passage,⁵ viz., 'destroyed' ('used up') occurs in Mald. 228 : *forwegen mid his wāpne*; cf. *bewegen* (em.), *ib.* 183.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

Modern English : Its Growth and Present Use.

By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

The title of Dr. Krapp's book is unhappily chosen. The main title, *Modern English*, is misleading since the author deals for the most part with the language of the past. The sub-title, *Its Growth and Present Use*, contains the redundant word "present" and is otherwise clumsy. A better title, in the reviewer's opinion, would be *The English Language*, with or without sub-title.

A text-book, we take it, should combine breadth of scope with underlying unity of design. Dr. Krapp is perhaps the first writer of a text-book on the English language who has succeeded in combining these two requirements. The works on the English language by Greenough and Kittredge, Bradley, and Jespersen are, of course, not designed primarily as text-books, being limited for the most part to a consideration of but one aspect of the language.¹ The works of Louns-

⁵ Cf. Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften zur deutschen Philologie*, p. 442; Heinzel, *l. c.*, p. 54.

¹ Thus Kittredge and Greenough in *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, The Macmillan Co., 1901, are

bury and Emerson, though planned on a sufficiently comprehensive scale to meet the requirements of a text-book, are divided into sections which convey an inadequate sense of the fundamental unity of the subject with which they deal.² Dr. Krapp, on the other hand, is neither one-sided nor piecemeal in his treatment of his theme. Within the compass of eight compact and closely interrelated chapters he presents all that the beginner needs to know with regard to the more important sides of English. Furthermore, his treatment is scholarly and his style distinguished by a vivacity as rare as it is refreshing in text-books on linguistic subjects.

The book consists of an introductory and a concluding chapter (chaps. I and VIII), in which the author presents his own personal views upon the question of good English, and of six intermediate chapters (chaps. II-VII), in which he deals more objectively with the following topics: *The English People* (chap. II), *The English Language* (chap. III), *English Inflections* (chap. IV), *English Sounds* (chap. V), *English Words* (chap. VI), and *English Grammar* (chap. VII). Dr. Krapp's discussion of the general problem of good English merits more than passing consideration and may best be examined by itself before turning to a consideration of the more specific topics discussed in the chapters that intervene.

According to Dr. Krapp, good English is determined not by any ideal standard of excellence but by the practical standard of social usefulness. "Language," he writes (p. 5), "is a form of social custom and its function is the expression of

social ideas." Again (p. 6), that language is "the best which enables men to express themselves most fully and satisfactorily in their relations to each other." Still again (p. 9), it is in "the immediate social relations of man with man" that "the final test" of language lies.

No one, we believe, will be disposed to question the essential soundness of this conception of language as a distinctively social institution.³ No modern language illustrates the operation of social forces as conspicuously as English. The social efficiency of our language has unquestionably resulted in no small measure from such mutual adjustment between the foreign and native elements of the language as would facilitate intercourse between Anglo-Saxon and Norman. It is primarily to this need for intercommunication between native and foreigner that we must ascribe the loss of grammatical gender, the virtual abandonment of inflection, and other simplifying processes which have rendered English a peculiarly efficient medium of expression.

To the author's opinion as to the means by which social efficiency may be promoted, decided exception must, however, be taken. Krapp maintains that language is a democratic institution and that social efficiency is to be determined not by the authority of the few but by the practice of the many. "Whenever," he writes (p. 326), "two minds come into satisfactory contact with each other, through the medium of language, we have then, so far as each instance taken by itself is concerned, a good use of language. The rustic with his dialect, and in his own homogeneous speech community, realizes as much the purpose of language as the most polished speaker in the 'best society' of the city." So likewise with respect to the speech of the nation as a whole. "A

concerned primarily with the life history of English words; Bradley in *The Making of English*, The Macmillan Co., 1904, with the fortunes of the English inflectional system; and Jespersen in *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Teubner, 1905, with a variety of interesting problems, mainly connected with English syntax.

² Thus Emerson divides his *History of the English Language*, The Macmillan Co., 1895, into what are virtually five independent sections, entitled respectively *The Relations of English to Other Languages*, *The Standard Language and the Dialects*, *The English Vocabulary*, *The Principles of English Etymology*, and *The History of English Inflections* and Lounsbury, Henry Holt and Co., 1904, divides his *History of the English Language*, into two equally distinct sections, entitled respectively *General History* and *History of Inflections*.

³ Save Mr. Clayton Hamilton, who in a review of *Modern English* in the *Forum*, Vol. XLII, pp. 277 ff., claims that the author's social view of language makes no allowance for the fine phrase of the poet, which he claims would be ruled out of court by Krapp's utilitarian test. In reply it need only be said that the author is not writing an "Ars Poetica," and that, even if he were, there is nothing in his social theory of good English that in any way militates against the very evident fact that a feeling of exceptional elevation can be adequately conveyed only by a corresponding heightening in the form of expression.

democracy⁴ which is not self-expressive and self-determining," he writes (p. 7), "is not a real democracy," and again (p. 8), "democracy works from the bottom up, and not from the top down." Hence (p. 9) "the general level" of a democratic speech can be raised "only by the sum of all the acts of the people who make up the whole." It is here evident that the author makes no distinction between the speech of the isolated community and that of the nation at large but regards the latter in no less degree than the former as nothing more or less than the collective speech activity of the several individuals of which it consists. Hence he concludes that all progress in language must proceed from a general raising of the level of this aggregate from below upwards.

To this view of the democratic nature of language the reviewer is emphatically opposed. He believes, on the contrary, that the real no less than the literary language is essentially an aristocratic institution. For while language, as the author rightly contends, is a social institution, and those forms of expression best which best serve that purpose of intercommunication for which language exists, it is evident that the conditions of intercommunication in the rustic community differ widely from these same conditions in the nation at large; and that those forms of expression which serve all the ends of intercommunication in the former will entirely fail to serve those same ends in the latter. It is precisely at this point that the author's analogy between the speech of a local community and of the nation as a whole breaks down. Within the narrow limits of a primitive community it is quite possible for each individual to make his simple wants known to his neighbor in a dialect which for that community will serve all the purposes of social efficiency. Such a dialect the individual might presumably master instinctively and without reference to any standard beyond the borders of his own community. But the more complex social needs of a nation, involving, as they do, intercommunication beyond the borders of a local community, clearly demand the adoption of a norm

of speech which shall prove intelligible throughout the nation. Such a norm of speech it is quite beyond the powers of even the most highly gifted member of the nation to master without the aid of systematic training and instruction. When we pass, in other words, from the local community to the nation at large, social efficiency clearly demands the adoption of a standard which is no longer local but national in scope. The need of such a standard the author himself appears to recognize when he writes (p. 7) "the national speech of a democracy cannot be sectional." But to this statement he adds, in the very same sentence, the apparently contradictory assertion, "If there is not one uniform speech acceptable to the whole nation, then the speech of one region must have equal authority with that of another." For if "the speech of one region" should "have equal authority with that of another," then manifestly the national speech of a democracy could not be otherwise than sectional. As a matter of fact, however, such a state of affairs is entirely impossible. In the constant struggle for existence, which pervades language no less than every other form of human activity, it is quite inconceivable that the dialects of two separate regions should retain equal authority. Even before our modern days of rapid intercommunication between all parts of the English-speaking world, one dialect—the Midland—grew at the expense of the others and became, through superior social efficiency, the recognized standard throughout the English nation. While therefore, it is, of course, true that good English ultimately springs from dialectal English—and might, therefore, be styled democratic in origin—it by no means follows that dialectal English is good English. No matter how freely a given locution may have passed current within a local community, it does not deserve to be ranked as good English until it has received the sanction of national approval by surviving the test of the broadest social usage. It thus appears clear that to secure an efficient medium of communication throughout the nation a national standard of some sort must be adopted. Every individual is necessarily limited in his speech experience by birth, natural aptitude, and social environment. The same limitation applies—though to a less degree—to any class or community of individuals. It is

⁴ The use of the term democracy—frequently employed by the author—is objectionable because it implies that language develops differently under a democracy than under a monarchy or any other form of government.

only by laying hold of a standard which transcends personal, local, and professional limitations that the individual may enter into possession of the accumulated wisdom of the ages and enjoy communication with those of his own contemporaries who live outside the range of his own limited experience. In other words, good English appears to us to be a distinctively aristocratic institution since it represents the survival of the forms of speech best fitted to serve both as a past and as a present medium for national intercommunication.

We believe, however, that it is a wholesome desire to protest against the too frequent tendency to accept some one particular standard as final that has led Dr. Krapp to pass to the opposite extreme of denying the validity of any external standard whatsoever. For it is undoubtedly true, as the author constantly implies, that no single opinion can be regarded as an infallible guide in matters of language. No so-called "authority," self-constituted or otherwise, be it grammar, dictionary, literary academy, or any particular group of writers or speakers, whether living or committed to the peaceful recesses of a library "shelf," can possess any validity other than that conferred by the more or less limited range of social experience of which that authority happens to be the expression. If language is a social institution, it must be left free to develop as a natural result of the ever widening social experience of the race. This it obviously cannot do if checked and hampered by the necessarily limited prescriptions of any single "authority" or set of "authorities." But if language should not be permitted to suffer from the prescriptions of dogmatic authority, just as little should it be allowed to suffer from the limitations of individual experience. To allow the solitary judgment of the individual to replace the winnowed verdict of the race would be to mistake the true nature of social efficiency and to obtain a chaos of individual instances in place of a national uniformity determined by the collective experience of the race. A standard of some sort, therefore, must exist and to that standard the individual must conform, unless he undertake to defeat the ends of language by preferring a less to a more efficient medium of communication.

But to what source of information—if not to some definite authority—shall the bewildered wan-

derer in the mazes of the English language turn for linguistic guidance? In answer to this question the reviewer can only express his conviction that the English language may be likened to virtue or any other moral quality. Virtue is never found perfectly exemplified in the practice of any single person or in the teaching of any single school. Yet no one would be disposed to deny the objective existence of virtue and the very urgent necessity incumbent upon everyone of acquiring it. Nor would any diligent seeker after virtue be at a loss how to come by it. He would discern instinctively as much of the path at any given moment as he would be able to pursue. So likewise in the matter of language. While not even the most accomplished individual may safely trust to his own unenlightened instincts in matters of speech, even the most ignorant at once recognizes good English when he hears or reads it. For a while he must, to be sure, rely upon the example of men of wider social experience than himself, but the more extensive his own speech contact with his fellows becomes the less will he be compelled to depend upon the practice or teaching of others. But until he has exhausted the social experience of the race, his need for instruction from others can never wholly disappear.

We now pass to a consideration of chapters II-VII, in which the author gives an objective and, for the most part, historical presentation of the more important phases of the English Language.

In his chapter on The English People (chap. II), Krapp reviews briefly the several settlements in England. Occasional exceptions must be taken to statements in this chapter. Thus it was not (p. 16) all "the Celtic inhabitants" of the island "who called themselves Britons" but only the Celtic inhabitants of the South, as distinguished from the Goidels of the North. It appears to the reviewer questionable whether (p. 17) *street* was borrowed from the Romans "both on the continent and in Britain" and not rather in Britain alone. The fact that *street*, *wall*, *wine*, etc. (cf. p. 212) occur not only in Old English but also in various continental German dialects, hardly seems to warrant the assumption that these words were borrowed before the Anglo-Saxons left the continent. Why not allow the possibility that

these words—like OE. *ceaster*—were borrowed from the Romanized Britons in Britain? In Britain *street* was not “borrowed from the Roman soldiers,” who had left that country before the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons, but from the Romanized Britons, who remained. By opposing the names “Roman citizens” (p. 19) and “Roman Britons” (p. 20) to “Celts” (p. 19) the author seems to imply that the Romanized Britons were not Celts but Romans. The Britons of the South, including Vortigern and his followers, were, of course, of the same race as the Celts against whom they fought. Hengist and Horsa are generally supposed to have been Jutes and not (p. 20) Saxons. Worthy of special commendation is the vivacious and convincing manner in which, at the end of the chapter, the author disposes of the attempts to introduce Esperanto and other artificial languages into general use.

In his chapter on The English Language (chap. III) Dr. Krapp enumerates the main branches of the Indo-Germanic family of languages (with their subdivisions), and describes the chief characteristics of the Teutonic branch. It may appear futile, at this late date, to express a personal preference for Indo-Germanic as a more appropriate designation than Indo-European (p. 44) for a family of languages that includes Iranian and excludes many languages of Europe. The judicially brief remarks upon primitive speech (p. 45) are in harmony with the generally nugatory results of recent investigation upon this obscure and much vexed topic. The statement (p. 46) that British was the language of “the original inhabitants of Britain” is, of course, incorrect and contradicts the previous correct statement (p. 15) that the original inhabitants were “different pre-historic races about whom little is known.” In the list of the several branches of the Indo-Germanic family of languages, enumerated from East to West (p. 45), the demands both of geography and of rhetoric require that the Teutonic (p. 46), and not the Balto-Slavic (p. 47), stand last. For *cornus* (p. 51) read *cornu*. To the inexperienced reader the expression (p. 52) “tracing back” English words to their cognates in other Indo-European languages could hardly fail to convey the impression that English is in some way derived from these languages. At the

end of the chapter the author divides the history of the language into the three main periods of Old, Middle, and Modern English and proposes to trace the development of “sounds, inflections, words, and syntax” through each of these periods.

In his chapter on *English Inflections* (chap. IV) Dr. Krapp defines the term inflection and traces the fortunes of the English inflectional system through the Old, Middle, and Modern English periods. The author’s statement of the distinction between inflection, derivation, and composition is unsatisfactory. “It is best,” he writes (p. 57) “to regard inflection as the general term, including inflection proper and derivation, and to use the specific term derivation, or composition, for those instances in which the elements of a word are plainly felt to have separate existence.” The following objections may be made to this use of the term inflection. In the first place, the author proposes to employ the term inflection in two different senses, in a narrow sense, to indicate “inflection proper,” i. e., a change in the form of a word to indicate a change in its grammatical relation, and in a broad sense, to include “derivation or composition” as well. In the pages that follow, however, he uses inflection only in the narrow sense and this, to avoid logical confusion,⁵ is the sense to which the term should be limited.⁶ In the second place, the terms derivation and composition cannot be restricted to words in which “the elements are plainly felt to have separate existence.” Thus the derivative element *-ly* in *likely* and the two compositional elements in *lord* (< OE. *hlāford*), though once independent, are now no longer felt to have separate existence. Finally, it would be well to draw a sharp distinction between derivation and composition by restricting the term derivation to the formation of a new word by putting together an old word and a prefix or suffix or both (e. g., *unlike*, *likely*, *unlikely*), and the term composition to the formation of a new word by putting together two old words (railroad). The redupli-

⁵ As well as to provide a term correlative with derivation and composition.

⁶ Since grammarians have not yet evolved a term applicable alike to the three processes of inflection, derivation, and composition, it would be better either to invent such a term or else to rest content with a statement of the essential similarity of the principles involved in the three processes.

cation in Old English might be compared to the reduplication more aptly than to the (p. 57) "augment in Greek." The comparative and superlative formations of the Modern English adjective and adverb cannot (p. 60) "be called composition." The *-er* and *-est* terminations are inflectional terminations while the comparison in *more* and *most* is a phrasal, not a compositional formation. The author's statement (p. 61) that all the Modern English pronouns other than the personal pronouns inflect only for number and case fails to take account of the demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that*, which do not inflect for case. Exception must be taken to the statement (p. 64) that the dative case of the noun is "lost in Modern English," whereas the accusative case survives in the Modern English objective. The mere fact that in the former case the noun is usually preceded by a preposition, by no means deprives it of the right to be regarded as a dative. For the dative relation may be expressed without the preposition (cf. "I gave the man a blow"). Moreover, as the author takes pains to explain (pp. 312 ff.), function rather than form is the determining factor in Modern English grammar and there can be no doubt that the function of indirect object is as definite and distinct in Modern English as that of direct object. The various inflectional terminations of the Old English noun (p. 65) and adjective (p. 67) might better be arranged so that the forms peculiar to a given declension shall stand in a row by themselves. Old English *bēc* would give regularly Modern English *beech* and not (p. 66) *beek* (cf. OE. *brēc* > Mod.E. *breeches*). Is it not possible that Modern English "*she*" may, like the plural of the personal pronoun, be due quite as much to the influence of the corresponding Scandinavian demonstrative pronoun as to (p. 71) "the Old English" demonstrative adjective *sēo*, which is rarely used as a pronoun? The adverb in *-um* (p. 72) persists in the current Modern English *seldom* as well as "in the archaic *whilom*." The adjective *exceeding* in the Biblical phrase (p. 72) "*exceeding glad*" is far more probably an instance of the contemporary use of the adjective for the adverb (cf. Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, second edition, I, 379) than of the so-called "flat" adverb (cf. *fast*, *slow*, etc.). Some explanation should

be given of the term (p. 72) "verbals." The statement (p. 74) that "the only kind of word stress which could have preserved the full inflectional endings of the Old English period is a general or distributed stress, spread over the word as a whole," appears to contradict the previous assertion (p. 50) that in Old English "words of native origin usually take the stress on the root syllable." Some modification is obviously necessary in order to reconcile these two statements. The Middle English leveling of the Old English full inflections left (p. 78) "no means" but just as much "reason" as ever for keeping up the distinction of grammatical gender. The tendency in the Middle English period to convert strong verbs into weak was not (p. 82) "developed still further in the Modern English period." On the contrary, this tendency received a check in the later Middle English period, with the result that the number of originally strong verbs in the language is no smaller today than at the close of the Middle English period, while, as Lounsbury points out (*History of the English Language*, p. 154 and pp. 349 ff.), examples are not wanting in Modern English of the converse change from weak to strong. The poetic *kine* might be added (p. 85) to the list of survivals of the old weak declension in Modern English. For *Ðā ealde men* (p. 95) read *Ðā ealdan men*. It is not easy to see what the author means by saying (p. 94) that the uninflected "type forms" of Modern English may, in contrast to the inflected forms of Old English, occupy "any position" in the sentence. For, as the author himself recognizes (p. 300), the absence of inflection and concord in Modern English renders a fixed word order more imperative now than formerly. Thus in Old English the verb might stand in the inverted, normal, or transposed order, according to circumstances, but in Modern English it generally occupies the normal position, whatever the circumstances may be.

The author opens his chapter on *English Sounds* with an admirably clear exposition of the functions of the several organs of speech. He then proceeds to describe the processes by which the various English sounds are produced and to classify the vowels and consonants. Since the term

spirant is defined (p. 108) so as to exclude the alveolar continuants and to include the continuants produced by "the teeth and lips," it is not clear why the author should exclude (p. 109) the labial continuant *w* and should include (p. 108) *s* and *z*, defined (p. 109) as "alveolar" continuants. Dr. Krapp appears to the reviewer to assign undue importance to imitation as a factor in sound change (pp. 125 ff.). Imitation can at best explain merely why sound changes when once started will continue to operate; it cannot explain how such changes originated. The author ends his chapter with a brief account of spelling reform, towards which he assumes an altogether sane and reasonable attitude.

In his chapter on *English Words* (chap. v) the author distinguishes two main processes in the development of the English vocabulary: (1) original creation, including the creation of new words and the adaptation of old words to new uses, and (2) borrowing from other languages. Particularly worthy of remark is the author's discussion, accompanied by numerous illustrative quotations from the literature of the day, of the controversy waged at the period of the Renaissance between the supporters and the opponents of the theory of enriching the language by wholesale borrowings from foreign languages. The following minor corrections or amplifications might be made upon this chapter, which is otherwise excellent in every way. *Berth* might be added (p. 186) to the list of derivatives from the verb *bear*. The second element in the compound "*upshot*" (p. 188) is a noun, not a "verb." It might well have been pointed out (p. 190) that the second, even more certainly than "the first element of OE. *ortgeard*" (cf. the *NED.*), is cognate with Lat. *hortus*. The words *fronts* and *backed* (p. 198) in the sentences "The house *fronts* the street" and "He *backed* the horse" are instances not of "adjectives" but of nouns which have "become verbs." Whatever one may think of *didoes*, it is hard to see for what reasons the slang words *bamboozle* and *cahoots* should be spoken of (p. 209) "as suggested by the high-sounding Latin vocabulary." Most readers would not accept the author's citation of *smart set*, *swagger*, and *swell* (p. 210) as examples of slang words which have escaped the taint of vulgarity because employed

by "leaders of fashion." These expressions are less frequently used by leaders of fashion than by others, and certainly carry with them distinctly sordid and vulgar connotations. The statement (p. 217) that the Anglo-Saxons, after settling in England, came into "renewed contact with the Scandinavians," implies a previous contact of which nothing is said. The author does not explain for what reasons the use of "*predicament*" (p. 281) in the sense of "*plight*" is any more subject to the charge of "vagueness" than *plight* itself is.

Dr. Krapp devotes his final chapter on the special aspects of the English language (chap. vii) to *English Grammar*. The term English grammar he restricts to a sense virtually synonymous with syntax, as distinguished from the broader use of the term to include sounds and inflections as well. The chapter is devoted to a discussion of a variety of typical tendencies in Modern English syntax. The most characteristic of these tendencies he attributes to the loss of inflection and to the consequent disposition to view the individual word as an independent unit in the sentence. For this reason the distinction between the several parts of speech is less closely observed in the English of today than in that of the earlier and more highly inflected periods of the language and a tendency to transfer a given word from one part of speech to another manifests itself more frequently now than formerly. Minor details only call for correction. It is unnecessary to repeat (p. 289) the popular use of *I han't* for *I have not* already cited once before on the preceding page. For "as result" (top of p. 291) read "as a result." The rules of Modern English orthography require that "the historically correct past participle" of *get* should be spelt *getten* (with two t's; cf. *gotten*) and not *geten* (p. 291). It would appear better (p. 292) to designate *lay* and *dived* as the historically correct rather than the "conventionally correct" forms of the past tense of *lie* and *dive* respectively. Though more frequently used than *laid* and *dove*, these forms are hardly employed with sufficient uniformity to be termed conventional. The statement (p. 293) that the use of "*will* in the first person and *shall* in the second and third" persons of the future tense of the verb is "generally unmistakably

determined" by the intention of the speaker is hardly compatible with the statement (p. 294) that in the use of these auxiliaries "the greatest freedom prevails." In the use of these auxiliaries in senses other than that of the simple future (which invariably requires *shall* in the first person and *will* in the second and third persons) it appears not that the greatest freedom prevails but rather that the rules, though approximately fixed for a given set of circumstances, vary so constantly with changes in the particular set of circumstances that a uniform rule for all cases is impossible. It would be better (p. 299) to distinguish the form *taxing* in the expression "for heavily taxing the people" from the infinitive *to tax* in the expression "to heavily tax the people" by calling the former a gerund or verbal noun rather than an "infinitive." The expression (p. 302) "the shortness of his leg prevented him running" does not, of course, belong in a list (p. 301) of examples of the verbal modified by a noun. In the expression (p. 309) "*I walked two hours*" and "*I walked two miles*" it is not the nouns *hours* and *miles* taken alone by themselves but coupled with the numeral *two* that form adverbs; otherwise we should have the strange phenomenon of an adverb modified by a numeral. The word *home* in the expression (p. 310) "I am going home" was not originally a "locative" but an accusative case used adverbially (cf. Bosworth-Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, sub *hām*). The so-called copulative verbs (p. 311) "may be followed" by predicate nouns as well as "by predicate adjectives," as in the example "She looked a dark Madonna," cited below (p. 312). In the sentence (p. 317) "I thank your Majesty for the cordial reception you have given us, and which we appreciate," it would appear more natural to regard the relative pronoun *which* as coördinate with a preceding relative, understood between reception and you, than as an instance of "mixed syntax." The full form of the sentence would then read "I thank your Majesty for the cordial reception which you have given us, and which we appreciate." The word *like* in the sentence (p. 319) "You are not like to find him here" is used as an adjective, not as "an adverb."

The following typographical errors have been

discovered: *Brtain* (p. 36); *English* (p. 39); *eb* (p. 319); omission of quantity in Old English *beon* (p. 73); *eower* (p. 89), by the side of *eow* on the same page; *eow* (p. 93); *ge* (p. 93). For "following excellent" in the quotation from Sir John Cheke (p. 245) read "following of other excellent."

NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.

Princeton University.

Schillers Wilhelm Tell. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Repetitional Exercises by BERT JOHN VOS, Professor of German in Indiana University. Ginn and Company, 1911.

This is in many respects the best edition of Schiller's masterpiece that has ever appeared in America. The editor has addressed himself deliberately and consistently to the modest though important task of producing a book adapted to the needs of high school and college students of German, who read *Tell* as their first classic drama. Introduction, notes, vocabulary, and *Fragen* aim, therefore, at a clarity and simplicity of statement demanded by the needs of the beginner. Every teacher of German in American institutions should hail as an omen of better things in our profession the emphatic assurance of the editor's preface that the *Fragen* are intended to "bring home anew to teacher or pupil the cardinal fact that in all modern language instruction the appeal should in the first instance be not to the eye but to the ear." The present writer shares with many of his colleagues the conviction that the college and the university have been discredibly slow to recognise practically this truth and to throw the weight of their influence in the direction of a more rational study of foreign languages in harmony with this principle.

Of the 444 pages of the volume, 57 are devoted to the introduction, 174 to the text of the drama, 89 to the notes, 4 to the appendix, 25 to the *Fragen*, and 92 to the vocabulary.

Moved by the conviction that the strongest appeal can be made to the interest of the student of Schiller through the presentation of an adequate amount of biographical detail, and that space, often wasted in editions of *Tell* upon an examina-